

### REMARKS

Claims 48-52 are pending in the application after entry of the present amendment.

Claims 48-52 are presented to claim compositions exemplified by examples 1-5, respectively, of the application as originally filed. The claimed compositions are neither taught nor suggested by the cited prior art, as evidenced by the Office Actions that have been entered in this case. In particular, the compositions of claims 48 and 50-52 include all the limitations of original claim 17, which was indicated to be patentable over the cited prior art in the Office Action dated February 1, 2005. The new claims have been further limited, however, to reduce the scope of original claim 17 by now covering only certain compositions within the original range that have been shown to have the properties identified in the application as filed. In particular, claim 48 covers compositions according to example 1 of the application as filed, claim 50 covers compositions according to example 3 of the application as filed, claim 51 covers compositions according to example 4 of the application as filed, and claim 52 covers compositions according to example 5 of the application as filed. All of those compositions have a piezoelectric strain constant  $d_{33}$  of at least 300 PC/N as originally specified by claim 17, and as originally shown by Table 1 of the application as filed..

New claim 49 covers compositions according to example 2 of the application as filed, and as shown by Table 1, such compositions provide a high mechanical quality factor ( $Q_m$ ) which is neither taught nor suggested by the cited prior art.

The claimed compositions are believed to avoid the §112 concerns stated in the earlier Office Actions because the new claims cover only certain compositions as identified above. As previously indicated, such compositions exhibit a piezoelectric

strain constant ( $d_{33}$ ) of at least 300 PC/N, and/or a high mechanical quality factor ( $Q_m$ ) of at least 1000, as evidenced by Table 1 of the application as filed.

Moreover, the new claims are believed to satisfy the written description of §112 because specific examples of the claimed compositions were included in the application as originally filed, particularly by examples 1-5 as indicated above. The new claims state such compositions in a way that was inherently disclosed by the application as filed, with the relative amounts of the various components being computable from the percentages disclosed in the examples.

For the reasons set forth above, favorable reconsideration of the amended application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Timothy N. Thomas  
Timothy N. Thomas, Esq.,  
Reg. No. 35,714  
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137  
(317) 634-3456 Telephone  
(317) 637-7561 Facsimile

Attorney for Applicant